

I am just deeply discouraged that a huge broadcaster like Sinclair Broadcasting can require their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election, especially since it appears to have no relevance to current issues.

Broadcasters use the public airwaves free of charge, and are supposedly obligated by law to serve the public interest. If that were really true for our democracy, candidates would not have to pay for their messages to the voting public. Time would be made available free of charge as it is in even developing countries like Mexico. In the past broadcasters seemed more motivated by public service, now as broadcasting corporations have become more consolidated, they seem more focused on the bottom line. News becomes entertainment, which I for one no longer watch very often. We need less consolidation and more public service. This seems to me to be one of reasons the FCC exists--to protect the space for public discourse and keep the playing field level.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.